



April 11, 2017

VIA FOIAONLINE.REGULATIONS.GOV

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticides Programs

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's
Communications with Monsanto Company

Dear FOIA Officer:

This is a request under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, *as amended* ("FOIA"), from the Center for Biological Diversity ("Center"), and U.S Right to Know, collectively ("Requesters"). The Center is a non-profit organization that works to secure a future for all species hovering on the brink of extinction through science, law, and creative media, and to fulfill the continuing educational goals of its membership and the general public in the process. U.S. Right to Know is a nonprofit organization that focuses on researching issues impacting consumer-oriented public policy issues involving the food industry.

REQUESTED RECORDS

The Requesters seek from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticides Programs ("EPA") all of the following records:

1. From January 1, 2012 to the date of the search all correspondence between, from, to, or with Jess Rowland and any employee or assign of Monsanto (including, but not limited to, Dan Jenkins and William Heydens) and the following individuals or combination of individuals: Jessilynn Taylor, Anna Lowit, Karlyn Middleton, Gregory Akerman, Lori Brunsman, Jonathan Chen, Anwar Dunbar, Ray Kent, Jessica Kidwell, John Liccione, Danielle Lobdell, Nancy McCarroll, Chris Schlosser, Charles Wood that mention or include the following terms: Glyphosate, Roundup and any of its associated products, including but not limited to, Roundup Xtend, inert ingredients in formulations containing glyphosate (POEA and AMPA in particular), glyphosate carcinogenicity analyses (including the terms "probable carcinogen" or "carcinogen"), California's Proposition 65, California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, glyphosate labeling, Cancer Assessment Review Committee ("CARC"), Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry ("ATSDR"), Center for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC"), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services ("DHHS"), scientific advisory panel ("SAP"), guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment, lymphoma, guidelines, statistic, statistical, statistically, control, controls, pair-wise, trend, International Agency for Research on Cancer ("IARC"), European food safety authority ("EFSA"), genotoxic,

- genotoxicity, genotoxin, oxidative, DNA damage, German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (“BfR”), Kier and Greim;
2. From January 1, 2012 to the date of the search all communications between Monsanto and Kerry Leifer regarding N-nitrosoglyphosate (“NNG”) and 1,4-Dioxane;
 3. From January 1, 2010 to the date of the search all communications mentioning or to or from Marion Copley;
 4. All email correspondence dated July 14, 2016 to Jack Housenger titled “FQPA Violations in OPP;” and
 5. All email correspondence dated May 18, 2015 titled “FQPA or Misconduct” to Bill Jordan and Stephen Dapson.

For purposes of this request, “records” is consistent with the meaning of the term under FOIA. This includes, but is not limited to, documents of any kind including electronic as well as paper documents, e-mails, writings (handwritten, typed, electronic or otherwise produced, reproduced or stored), correspondence, letters, memoranda, reports, consultations, papers, studies, notes, field notes, recordings, telephone conversation recordings, voice mails, telephone logs, messages, instant messages, G-chats, text messages, chats, telefaxes, data, data bases, drawings, surveys, graphs, charts, photographs, videos, meeting notes or minutes, electronic and magnetic recordings of meetings, maps, GIS layers, GPS, UTM, LiDAR, CDs, and any other compilations of data from which information can be obtained. All of the foregoing is included in this request if it is in EPA’s possession and control. If such records are no longer under the control of EPA but were at any time, please refer this request to the relevant federal agency or agencies. This request is being sent to the headquarters for EPA with the understanding that it will be forwarded to any other agency offices where responsive records may be located.

This request is not meant to exclude any other records that, although not specially requested, are reasonably related to the subject matter of this request. If you or your office have destroyed or determine to withhold any records that could be reasonably construed to be responsive to this request, I ask that you indicate this fact and the reasons therefore in your response.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies are prohibited from denying requests for information under FOIA unless the agency reasonably believes release of the information will harm an interest that is protected by the exemption. FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law No. 114-185), codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(8)(A).

If you decide to invoke a FOIA exemption, please include sufficient information for us to assess the basis for the exemption, including any interest(s) that would be harmed by release. Please include a detailed ledger which includes:

1. Basic factual material about each withheld record, including the originator, date, length, general subject matter, and location of each item; and
2. Complete explanations and justifications for the withholding, including the specific exemption(s) under which the record (or portion thereof) was withheld and a full explanation of how each exemption applies to the withheld material.

Such statements will be helpful in deciding whether to appeal an adverse determination. Your written justification may help to avoid litigation.

In addition, if you determine that portions of the records requested are exempt from disclosure, we request that you segregate the exempt portions and mail the non-exempt portions of such records to my attention at the address below within the statutory time limit. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).

The Requesters are willing to receive records on a rolling basis.

FORMAT OF REQUESTED RECORDS

Under FOIA, you are obligated to provide records in a readily-accessible electronic format and in the format requested. *See, e.g.*, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B) (“In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format requested by the person if the record is readily reproducible by the agency in that form or format.”).

“Readily-accessible” means text-searchable and OCR-formatted. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B). Please provide all records in a readily-accessible, electronic .pdf format. Additionally, please provide the records either in (1) load-ready format with a CSV file index or excel spreadsheet, or if that is not possible; (2) in .pdf format, without any “portfolios” or “embedded files.”

Portfolios and embedded files within files are not readily-accessible. Please do not provide the records in a single, or “batched,” .pdf file. We appreciate the inclusion of an index.

RECORD DELIVERY

We appreciate your help in expeditiously obtaining a determination on the requested records. As mandated in FOIA, we anticipate a reply within 20 working days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). Failure to comply within the statutory timeframe may result in the Requesters taking additional steps to ensure timely receipt of the requested materials. Please provide a complete reply as expeditiously as possible. You should email or mail copies of the requested records to:

Margaret E. Townsend
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211
mtownsend@biologicaldiversity.org

and

Carey L. Gillam
U.S. Right to Know
5525 Golden Bear Drive
Overland Park, Kansas 66223
careygillamnewsnow@yahoo.com

If you find that this request is unclear, or if the responsive records are voluminous, please call me at (971) 717-6409 to discuss the scope of this request.

REQUEST FOR FEE WAIVER

FOIA was designed to provide citizens a broad right to access government records. FOIA’s basic purpose is to “open agency action to the light of public scrutiny,” with a focus on the public’s “right to be informed about what their government is up to.” *U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 773-74 (1989) (internal quotation and

citations omitted). In order to provide public access to this information, FOIA's fee waiver provision requires that "[d]ocuments shall be furnished without any charge or at a [reduced] charge," if the request satisfies the standard. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). FOIA's fee waiver requirement is "liberally construed." *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1310 (D.C. Cir. 2003); *Forest Guardians v. U.S. Dept. of Interior*, 416 F.3d 1173, 1178 (10th Cir. 2005).

The 1986 fee waiver amendments were designed specifically to provide non-profit organizations such as the Requesters access to government records without the payment of fees. Indeed, FOIA's fee waiver provision was intended "to prevent government agencies from using high fees to discourage certain types of requesters and requests," which are "consistently associated with requests from journalists, scholars, and *non-profit public interest groups*." *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. 867, 872 (D. Mass. 1984) (emphasis added). As one Senator stated, "[a]gencies should not be allowed to use fees as an offensive weapon against requesters seeking access to Government information" 132 Cong. Rec. S. 14298 (statement of Senator Leahy).

I. The Requesters Qualifies for a Fee Waiver.

Under FOIA, a party is entitled to a fee waiver when "disclosure of the information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the [Federal] government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester." 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The EPA's regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(1)(2) and (3) establish the same standard.

Thus, the EPA must consider four factors to determine whether a request is in the public interest: (1) whether the subject of the requested records concerns "the operations or activities of the Federal government," (2) whether the disclosure is "likely to contribute" to an understanding of government operations or activities, (3) whether the disclosure "will contribute to public understanding" of a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject, and (4) whether the disclosure is likely to contribute "significantly" to public understanding of government operations or activities. 40 C.F.R. § 2.107(1)(2). As shown below, the Center meets each of these factors.

A. The Subject of This Request Concerns "The Operations and Activities of the Government."

The subject matter of this request concerns the operations and activities of the EPA. This request asks for: (1) from January 1, 2012 to the date of the search all correspondence between, from, to, or with Jess Rowland and/or any employee or assign of Monsanto including, but not limited to, Dan Jenkins and William Heydens, Monsanto and the following individuals or combination of individuals: Jessilyn Taylor, Anna Lowit, Karlyn Middleton, Gregory Akerman, Lori Brunsman, Jonathan Chen, Anwar Dunbar, Ray Kent, Jessica Kidwell, John Liccione, Danielle Lobdell, Nancy McCarroll, Chris Schlosser, Charles Wood that mention or include the terms: Glyphosate, Roundup and any of its associated products, including but not limited to, Roundup Xtend, inert ingredients in formulations containing glyphosate, carcinogenicity analyses (including the terms "probable carcinogen" or "carcinogen"), California's Proposition 65, California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, glyphosate labeling, Cancer

Assessment Review Committee (“CARC”), Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (“ATSDR”), Center for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (“DHHS”), scientific advisory panel (“SAP”), cancer, lymphoma, guideline, guidelines, guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment, International Agency for Research on Cancer (“IARC”), statistic, statistical, statistically, probable, European food safety authority (“EFSA”), control, controls, genotoxic, genotoxicity, genotoxin, oxidative, DNA damage, mechanism, German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (“BfR”), pair-wise, trend, Kier and Greim; (2) from January 1, 2012 to the date of the search all communications between Monsanto and Kerry Leifer regarding NNG and 1,4-Dioxane; (3) from January 1, 2010 to the date of the search all communications mentioning or to or from Marion Copley; (4) all email correspondence dated July 14, 2016 to Jack Housenger titled “FQPA Violations in OPP;” (5) all email correspondence dated May 18, 2015 titled “FQPA or Misconduct” to Bill Jordan and Stephen Dapson.

This FOIA will provide the Requesters and the public with crucial insight into the controversy surrounding the most popular pesticide globally, glyphosate. The unsealing of court records in class action litigation between Monsanto and cancer patients has revealed cooperation between Monsanto and the EPA to ensure that glyphosate was not labeled a carcinogen, and that the EPA has worked internally to ensure that glyphosate is not found to be capable of causing cancer. It is clear that designating glyphosate as a non-carcinogen is a specific and identifiable activity of the government, in this case the executive branch agency, the EPA. *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1313 (“[R]easonable specificity is all that FOIA requires with regard to this factor”) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, the Requesters meet this factor.

B. Disclosure is “Likely to Contribute” to an Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The requested records are meaningfully informative about government operations or activities and will contribute to an increased understanding of those operations and activities by the public.

Disclosure of the requested records will allow the Requesters to convey information to the public about the cooperation between Monsanto and the EPA leading to the assurance that glyphosate was not listed as carcinogenic. Once the information is made available, the Requesters will analyze it and present it to its numerous members, online activists, and the general public in a manner that will meaningfully enhance the public’s understanding of the use of this pesticide and its impact on human health and the environment.

Thus, the requested records are likely to contribute to an understanding of EPA operations and activities.

C. Disclosure of the Requested Records Will Contribute to a Reasonably Broad Audience of Interested Persons’ Understanding of Cooperation Between Monsanto and the EPA to Restrict Glyphosate’s Carcinogenic Status

The requested records will contribute to public understanding of how EPA’s involvement with Monsanto to ensure that glyphosate was not found to be a carcinogen is consistent with EPA’s

mission to “protect human health and the environment.”¹ As explained above, the records will contribute to public understanding of the EPA’s decision to ensure glyphosate was not found to be a carcinogen.

Management of pesticides generally, and specifically the cooperation between Monsanto and the EPA to exclude glyphosate from being listed as a carcinogen, are areas of interest to a reasonably-broad segment of the public. The Requesters will use the information it obtains from the disclosed records to educate the public about the collaboration between Monsanto and the EPA which downplayed the dangerous impact glyphosate may have on human and environmental health. *See W. Watersheds Proj. v. Brown*, 318 F.Supp.2d 1036, 1040 (D. Idaho 2004) (“... find[ing] that WWP adequately specified the public interest to be served, that is, educating the public about the ecological conditions of the land managed by the BLM and also how ... management strategies employed by the BLM may adversely affect the environment.”).

Through the Requesters’ synthesis and dissemination (by means discussed in Section II, below), disclosure of information contained in and gleaned from the requested records will contribute to a broad audience of persons who are interested in the subject matter. *Ettlinger v. FBI*, 596 F.Supp. at 876 (benefit to a population group of some size distinct from the requester alone is sufficient); *Carney v. Dep’t of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994), *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 823 (1994) (applying “public” to require a sufficient “breadth of benefit” beyond the requester’s own interests); *Cnty. Legal Servs. v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 557 (E.D. Pa. 2005) (in granting fee waiver to community legal group, court noted that while the requester’s “work by its nature is unlikely to reach a very general audience,” “there is a segment of the public that is interested in its work”).

Indeed, the public does not currently have an ability to easily evaluate the requested records, which concern possible cancer-inducing pesticides that the EPA (coupled with Monsanto) approved for safe use that are not currently in the public domain. *See Cnty. Legal Servs. v. HUD*, 405 F.Supp.2d 553, 560 (D. Pa. 2005) (because requested records “clarify important facts” about agency policy, “the CLS request would likely shed light on information that is new to the interested public.”). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *McClellan Ecological Seepage Situation v. Carlucci*, 835 F.2d 1282, 1286 (9th Cir. 1987), “[FOIA] legislative history suggests that information [has more potential to contribute to public understanding] to the degree that the information is new and supports public oversight of agency operations... ”²

Disclosure of these records is not only “likely to contribute,” but is certain to contribute, to public understanding of the alliance revealed between EPA and Monsanto, and the resulting EPA assessment finding that glyphosate is not carcinogenic. The public is always well served when it knows how the government conducts its activities, particularly matters touching on legal questions. Hence, there can be no dispute that disclosure of the requested records to the public

¹ See <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do>, (last visited April 6, 2017).

² In this connection, it is immaterial whether any portion of the Requesters’ request may currently be in the public domain because the Requesters’ request considerably more than any piece of information that may currently be available to other individuals. *See Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1315.

will educate the public about the health and environmental risks from using certain pesticides, and how the relationship between Monsanto and the EPA caused an underestimation of glyphosate as a carcinogen.

D. Disclosure is Likely to Contribute Significantly to Public Understanding of Government Operations or Activities.

The Requesters are not requesting these records merely for their intrinsic informational value. Disclosure of the requested records will significantly enhance the public's understanding of the EPA's decision to not find glyphosate as cancer-inducing as compared to the level of public understanding that exists prior to the disclosure. Indeed, public understanding will be *significantly* increased as a result of the disclosure of the records because the requested information will help reveal more about how the EPA's cooperation with Monsanto led to glyphosate not being listed as a carcinogen.

The records are also certain to shed light on EPA's compliance with its own mission to protect the environment.³ Such public oversight of agency action is vital to our democratic system and clearly envisioned by the drafters of the FOIA. Thus, the Requesters meet this factor as well.

II. The Requesters have a Demonstrated Ability to Disseminate the Requested Information Broadly.

The Center is a non-profit organization that informs, educates, and counsels the public regarding environmental issues, policies, and laws relating to environmental issues. The Center has been substantially involved in the activities of numerous government agencies for over 25 years, and has consistently displayed its ability to disseminate information granted to it through FOIA.

U.S. Right to Know is a nonprofit research organization dedicated to educating and informing members of the public about factual and timely matters related to food, food policy, and the health and safety of food systems and food products. The organization conducts investigations into the food system and shares its findings on its website, through reports and articles in news outlets, and directly with journalists at major news outlets for publication.

In consistently granting the Requesters' fee-waivers, agencies have recognized: (1) that the information requested by the Requesters contributes significantly to the public's understanding of the government's operations or activities; (2) that the information enhances the public's understanding to a greater degree than currently exists; (3) that the Requesters possess the expertise to explain the requested information to the public; (4) that the Requesters possess the ability to disseminate the requested information to the general public; (5) and that the news media recognizes the Requesters as established experts in the field of imperiled species, biodiversity, and impacts on protected species. The Requesters' track records of active participation in oversight of governmental activities and decision-making, and its consistent contribution to the public's understanding of those activities as compared to the level of public understanding prior to disclosure are well established.

³ See *supra* note at 1.

The Requesters intend to use the records requested here similarly. The Center's work appears in more than 2,500 news stories online and in print, radio and TV per month, including regular reporting in such important outlets as *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Los Angeles Times*. Many media outlets have reported on the dangers of pesticide use utilizing information obtained by the Center from federal agencies including the EPA. In 2016, more than 2 million people visited the Center's extensive website, viewing a total of more than 5.2 million pages. The Center sends out more than 277 email newsletters and action alerts per year to more than 1.2 million members and supporters. Three times a year, the Center sends printed newsletters to more than 52,343 members. More than 199,000 people have "liked" the Center on Facebook, and there are regular postings regarding the adverse impact to the environment and human health that pesticides pose. The Center also regularly tweets to more than 49,700 followers on Twitter. The Center intends to use any or all of these far-reaching media outlets to share with the public information obtained as a result of this request.

U.S. Right to Know's research has appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Guardian*, *Le Monde*, *Time Magazine*, *The Huffington Post*, and numerous other outlets. The organization also operates active social media for dissemination of its work to the public.

Public oversight and enhanced understanding of the EPA's duties is absolutely necessary. In determining whether disclosure of requested information will contribute significantly to public understanding, a guiding test is whether the requester will disseminate the information to a reasonably-broad audience of persons interested in the subject. *Carney v U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807 (2nd Cir. 1994). The Requesters need not show how they intends to distribute the information, because "[n]othing in FOIA, the [agency] regulation, or our case law require[s] such pointless specificity." *Judicial Watch*, 326 F.3d at 1314. It is sufficient for the Requesters to show how it distributes information to the public generally. *Id.*

III. Obtaining the Requested Records is of No Commercial Interest to the Requesters.

Access to government records, disclosure forms, and similar materials through FOIA requests is essential to the Center's role of educating the general public. Founded in 1994, the Center is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit conservation organization (EIN: 27-3943866) with more than 1.2 million members and online activists dedicated to the protection of endangered and threatened species and wild places.

U.S Right to Know is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization (EIN: 46-5676616) that works to illuminate issues important to consumers involving food and the American food system. We believe that transparency – in the marketplace and in politics – is crucial to building a better, healthier food system.

Neither the Center nor U.S. Right to Know has any commercial interest, and neither will realize any commercial benefit from the release of the requested records.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Requesters qualifies for a full fee-waiver. We hope that the EPA will immediately grant this fee waiver request and begin to search and disclose the requested records without any unnecessary delays.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (971) 717-6409 or foia@biologicaldiversity.org. All records and any related correspondence should be sent to my attention at the address below.

Sincerely,



Margaret E. Townsend
Open Government Staff Attorney
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211-0374
foia@biologicaldiversity.org

Carey Gillam
Research Director, U.S. Right to Know
5525 Golden Bear Drive
Overland Park, Kansas 66223
913-526-6190
carey@usrtk.org
careygillamNewsNow@yahoo.com